DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 088 380 HE 005 261

AUTHOR Lunine, Myron J.
TITLE "Alternatives to Tenure: Live Options"--The Hampshire Experiment.
PUB DATE [73]
NOTE 5p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50
DESCRIPTORS *Contracts; *Educational Innovation; *Higher Education; Job Tenure; *Teacher Employment; *Teacher Welfare; *Tenure
IDENTIFIERS *Hampshire College

ABSTRACT

The Renewable Contract Plan at Hampshire College makes certain assumptions: First, that traditional life tenure systems do not necessarily encourage continuing professional evaluation, nor do they necessarily encourage pedagogical experimentation, development, and renewal. The positive assumptions of the Renewable Contract Plan include: (1) periodic evaluation of faculty effectiveness in the reappointment process helps insure sustained quality among faculty; (2) career development will be encouraged among faculty who will be asked periodically to submit new proposals for their next contract terms; and (3) the college can continue to carry on experimental efforts by having an opportunity to discontinue faculty no longer committed to the major mission of the College. The Hampshire reappointment process substitutes for a single tenure decision renewable 3 to 7 year contracts, subject to the outcome of annual reviews by the dean and a thorough evaluation completed 17 months before the contract's termination date. (Author/PG)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 088380

HE 005 261

"Alternatives to Tenure: Live Options" -- The Hampshire Experiment

Myron J. Lunine
Dean of Hampshire College

We at Hampshire College are nearing our twentieth year of planning efforts and finishing our fourth year with new a steady-state student body of 1,250 in residence, 250 on leaves, and a faculty of 125 persons occupying about 80 f.t.e.'s -- all living and working within a quite viable Five College Consortium.

Our first experiment -- and this order is not one of priority or sequence necessarily -- is a financial experiment. We are attempting to be a private, high-quality, experimenting liberal arts college that derives all its operating budget from fees. This effort necessitates a 16 student to 1 faculty ratio and a one full professor to two associate to four assistant composition of faculty ranks. Our second experiment is an experiment in governance. This is an extraordinary intentional effort at diffusing power, decentralizing authority, sharing responsibility, and maximizing participation. This experiment has some of the best and worst features of Periclean Athens, the Byzantine Empire, the Federalist Papers, Early Adam Smith, Late Rousseau, Proudhon, and Mao Tse-Tung. Our third experiment is an effort at building community and individual and corporate citizenship -- and on this subject, as on any of the other experimental efforts, one could speak for a very long time indeed. Our fourth experiment is an experiment at Five College Cooperation with the four institutions that actually spawned us (Smith, Mount Holyoke, Amherst, and the University of Massachusetts) now working with us on principles of coordination, complementarity, and reciprocity.

Our fifth and sixth experiments are more at the heart of the educational venture itself. They are an experiment at restructuring the academic organization, which has us having four multi-disciplinary Schools with cross-School appointments and programs, and the very central experiment at redefining and assessing the educational progress by examinations at three consecutive Divisional levels -- in lieu of grades, credit hours, and class standing. These last two experiments give us an educational way of life in which each student enjoys (or endures) self-defined, self-paced, self-placed Programs of learning.

The implications of this educational way of life for the teacher's role are far-reaching indeed. For the teacher's role at Hampshire is more facilitative than didactic, more advisory than directive. It is richly infused with diverse pedagogical and convivial interactions and transactions. It is greatly varied and demanding in response to each student's needs, interests, and possibilities. In short, the faculty load is heavy (in several senses of the word).

Now underlying our Renewable Contract Plan are of course certain assumptions. First, that traditional life tenure systems do not necessarily encourage continuing professional self-experimentation or evaluation by one's own peers and students. Nor do they necessarily encourage pedagogical experimentation, development, and renewal. Nor are they necessarily the only way to insure academic freedom and professional dignity.

In an AAUP letter to Hampshire College in 1971, the statement was made that, "Academic freedom and tenure are inseparable principles." I sincerely hope not, for academic freedom is too precious a fruit to grow on only one tree -- especially in this period of pruning and worse ....

With respect to our efforts, we have made certain positive assumptions. First, that the periodic evaluation of faculty effectiveness in the reappointment process helps insure sustained quality among faculty. Second, that career development will be encouraged among faculty who will be asked periodically to submit new proposals for their next contract term. Third, that the College can continue to carry on experimental efforts by having an opportunity to discontinue faculty no longer committed to the major mission of the College. Fourth, that the College will encourage and develop new career opportunities for departing faculty.

We also have assumed that inevitably there will be problems in our system. First, that agreed-upon definitions underlying judgmental decisions, and evaluative procedures having high consensual endorsement, will be very difficult to achieve. Second, that peer evaluation across all ranks (in the absence of a tenured senior faculty), and student participation (in the interstices of personalized, if not intimate, faculty-student relationships) might lead to a lowering of standards.

Our positive assumptions are yet to be validated. We have been more clever and prescient in anticipating the problems.

Very briefly, what is our policy and its process? Our policy, formally adopted in 1971, and reaffirmed this past Fall, is to appoint faculty normally for four years under a renewable contract plan, rather than the 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure procedures enforced at the majority of institutions. We, of course, endorse the Statement on Academic Freedom and have rigorous procedures for safe-guarding such freedom.

Our Reappointment process substitutes for a single tenure decision renewable three to seven year contracts, subject to the outcome of annual reviews by the School Dean and a thorough evaluation completed seventeen months before the contract's termination date. This evaluation for reappointment purposes is initiated by the Dean of the College and conducted by the School to which the faculty member is assigned, by a College Committee consisting of the College Dean, five elected faculty, and two elected students, and by the President.

In the process the candidate up for reappointment, his/her School Dean, the School through its special committee or a committee of the whole, the College Dean, members of the College and wider communities, and the President and Trustees all have roles and responsibilities to deal expeditiously and judiciously with crucial and sometimes confidential materials.

The first appointment and all reappointments are based on merit: professional competence and promise as a <u>teacher</u> (in many kinds of faculty-student transactions), as a <u>scholar</u> (public or private research, artistry, or craftsmanship; evidence of scholarly, artistic, or pedagogical productivity), and as a <u>contributor</u> to the life and well-being of the College, the Consortium, or wider communities.

What has been our experience thus far? After all, we have had four reappointment rounds by now. One deceptively simple answer seems to reside in some statistics: of sixty-three faculty members up for reappointment in the past four years, two have been turned down by the College Committee on Faculty Reappointments, with the President upholding one of those decisions; two have been turned down by the President whom the College Committee on Faculty Reappointments had recommended for reappointment -- resulting in three non-reappointments out

of sixty-three, with one of the three now appealing his case. But such numbers bear a great deal of scrutiny and explication.

We have much work to do if we are to solve the problem of diverse definitions as to what is good (good teaching, good advising, etc.); the problem of inconsistency of procedures and inadequacy or unevenness of materials at each level and during each phase of the process; the problem of the bias of data generated only for the occasion of reappointment considerations; the problem of the reappointment process becoming the preoccupation of too many faculty -- with the possible consequences of anxiety and conformism; the problem of the Reappointment Syndrome ironically discouraging daring, adventurous, fruitful pedagogical failures.

On the positive side, we are moving by Academic Council mandate and by growing consensus toward increasing consistency of values, definitions, and procedures; increasing sophistication and professionalism in continuous evaluation of teaching and advising; increasing awareness on the part of virtually all of us at the College of the complexity, fragility, and worth of what we are trying to do.

For what we are trying to do is to create a mentality and construct an instrumentality that: (1) Services the Faculty with respect to academic freedom, professional dignity, just rewards, and reasonable job security; (2) Serves the interests of the Students with respect to giving them a quality faculty that is able, amiable, and exemplary and a real role to play in the process; (3) Serves the interests of Hampshire College with respect to renewal of faculty (in two senses), improvement of our evaluation systems, and participation by all members of the community; (4) Serves the interests of the Institution with respect to the building of the faculty, the shaping of curricula and programs, and the living within the fiscal parameters; (5) Serves, in a small way, perhaps, Higher Education as a pertinent pilot effort and as a possible model.

Will we succeed? In playing prophet, or at least predictor, one must take into account, among other things, the general return to educational orthodoxy, the anti-intellectualism and genuine economic constraints that affect and afflict

the Academy and the academic market place, the possible impacts on tenure systems and on contract systems of collective bargaining, and, of course, the condition and direction of the half-dozen other Hampshire College experiments I mentioned at the outset.

For me, the real question is not whether our present problems (diversity of definitions, inconsistency of practices, protrusion of personalities and politics) preclude our contract system's accomplishing its purposes. Nor is the question whether this difficult and demanding contract system itself helps develop a culture and an environment appropriate and conducive to the humane and efficient functioning of the contract system.

The question is -- and this is a question worthy of each of us always -- how do we understand and manage processes that are both the means and the ends of rational and compassionate institutions and of academically free and educationally responsible individuals?

MJL:jb